DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 480 EA 018 183

AUTHOR Ogletree, Earl J.
TITLE Illinois Superintendents' Opinion and Implementation of the National Education Reforms.
SPONS AGENCY Chicago State Univ. Foundation, IL.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 66p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Administrative Change; *Administrator Attitudes; Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduation Requirements; Questionnaires; Required Courses; Special Programs; Superintendents; Teacher Education; Teacher Role; Time on Task
IDENTIFIERS *Excellence in Education; Illinois

ABSTRACT

According to a recent survey, school superintendents in Illinois generally favor the kinds of educational reforms being urged by national commissions on educational excellence. Over 100 superintendents from randomly selected elementary, secondary, and combined school districts in Illinois responded to the 104-item questionnaire. The survey sought the superintendents' opinions of specific suggested reforms in the areas of curriculum, requirements for graduation and college admission, the use of instructional time, academic standards, student discipline, programs for special student populations, the roles of teachers and teaching, and teacher preparation. The only reforms that the superintendents either rejected or were ambivalent about were increases in fine arts and foreign language programs, extension of the school year, the continued use of mainstreaming in elementary school districts, the awarding of differential diplomas on the basis of standardized tests, the provision of career-related courses for women and minority students, and the assumption of certain administrative responsibilities by teachers. The survey also gathered data on the implementation of reforms. The respondents indicated that curricular reform was receiving their greatest attention, standards and expectations the second greatest, and teacher reforms the least. The document includes a question-by-question breakdown of the survey responses. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Earl J. Ogletree

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED267480

ILLINOIS SUPERINTENDENTS' OPINION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION REFORMS

(Funded by the Chicago State University Foundation)

August 1985

by

Earl J. Ogletree, EdD
Professor of Education
Chicago State University
95th at King Drive
Chicago, IL 60628

EA 018 183

Education is the most important task facing the United States today and in the future. The issuance of public and private reports on the status of the need for reform in the American schools received much attention of the American community--from the President to parents. Nine reports were issued on teachers and teaching in elementary and secondary schools and six reports on postsecondary education. The most noted and widely publicized reports dealt with public and elementary and secondary education. Reports from the National Commission on Excellence in Teaching: "A Nation at Risk", The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force: The Imperative for Educational Reform and the Education Commission of the States--Task Force on Education for Economic Growth: "Action for Excellence" and other reports, in general, have called for quality education, parental participation, higher education standards, increased course requirements and other major changes. [1,2,3]

Specifically, the three reports recommended a myriad of reforms for students: 1) minimum number of years of English, math and science, etc. to receive a high school diploma, 2) foreign languages for the college bound, 3) upgrade course content, 4) more time devoted to new basics, 5) update and upgrade texts and teaching materials, more homework, 6) more emphasis on study and work skills, 7) longer school day and year, 8) programs for special students, 9) remedial education academies, 10) increase college entrance requirements and student performance, 11) effective use of standardized testing, 12) promotion based on achievemnt, not age and 13) effective attendance and discipline policies.

The reports also devoted an entire set of recommendations for teachers: 1) improvement of teacher preparation, 2) high education and aptitude standards, 3) certification in a content area, 4) career ladders, 5) extended

contracts for curriculum and professional development, 6) increase in teachers salaries to $40,000-$50,000, 7) teacher performance and evaluation, 8) recognition of teaching as a profession, 9) loans and grants for prospective teachers and 10) master teacher programs.

Other areas of the reports dealt with leadership and administration (accountability and competence), fiscal support (federal and local), federal government role (protecting civil rights, student financial assistance, etc.), implementation of plans and business/education partnerships.

The recommendations of these and other reform reports, if implemented, will have a significant influence on public policy and the role of education in American society. Their implementation would influence the curriculum, graduation, language proficiency, length of school day, textbooks and instructional material, programs, fellowships for academies, college entrance requirements, student performance standards; attendance, discipline and failure policies, teacher recognition, preparation, certification and salaries. The reforms would also effect the way schools are administered, funded and the role of the federal government and the business community in the educational process of the elementary and secondary schools and the training of teachers.

It would and has forced state governments and teacher training centers to review and revise their education priorities. Illinois has recently passed the Better Schools Program SB730.[4] The package was put together by a variety of key groups such as teachers unions and school administrators. The enacted reform includes many of the recommendation proposed in the national reform reports. However, the legislature has not fully addressed the question of funding these essential reforms.

One of the problems with massive reforms is its failure to recognize distinctly local problems, such as the needs of urban, suburban and rural populations and the socioeconomic and ethnic differences between school districts. It is recommended that educational changes begin in the local school districts, at the grassroots level. The success of imposed mandates are, at best, suspect unless there is enough input and autonomy at the district level to adapt them to their local needs.

The issue of education reform is current and critical. Since the proposed reforms will impact Illinois educators, there is a need to know Illinois school administrators' opinions of the selected education reforms as outlined in the national reports.

Procedure

The purpose of this study was to determine the opinions of Illinois school administrators of the selected education reforms. The objectives of the study was designed to provide answers to the following general questions:

1. What are administrators opinions of school reform recommendations?
2. What are their opinions of student reforms:
   a. Curriculum reforms?
   b. Graduation requirements?
   c. Efficiency of time utilization?
   d. Standards and expectation?
   e. Programs for special populations?
   f. College entrance requirements?
3. What are their opinions of teacher reforms:
   a. Role of teachers and teaching?
   b. Teacher preparation?
4. What are their opinions of administrative reform?

The data were obtained via a non-normative survey. A 104-item-forced-choice and open-ended questionnaire was sent to 250 randomly selected Illinois school district. The instrument was pilot tested on twenty educators who did not participate in the study. One hundred four questionnaires were

returned. The data were analyzed in terms of the percentage of responses, and the independent variables of positions and type of school district were cross tabulated with the responses.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Results

Curriculum Reform

The overall results showed the majority of superintendents significantly favored (.05) school reform. In response to items on curricular reform. the majority (72%) of superintendent believed more time and emphasis should be given to basics at the elementary school level. This included the areas of English (79%) writing skills(89%), math computational skills (85%), science (68%), social studies (54%), computer literacy (80%) and 58 percent each for foreign languages and the arts. On the other hand, superintendents of secondary districts and combined (elementary and secondary) districts significantly favored (58% to 77%) an increased emphasis in the same subject area, except foreign languages. Only 46 percent of all and elementary school districts and 44 percent of secondary and 48 percent of combined school district superintendents supported foreign languages.

To the questions "Should there be more vigorous programs in the five and performance arts, vocational education and preparation for the world of work?", the total sample and elementary district superintendents were divided on "fine arts and performance. Both secondary and combined districts (50% and 52%, respectively) rejected more rigorous programs in this area. Surprisingly, all superintendents, except those of combined districts who rejected the idea, were also ambivalent on the increase in vocational education programs. On the other hand, superintendents at all levels (57% to 72%) supported additional programs to prepare students for the world of work.

Although the sample was ambivalent about the role of fine arts and vocational education in the curriculum, the majority believed that certain

curricular offerings should be mandated rather than elective.

On the "mastery of skills beyond the basics", 72 percent of the sample, regardless of type of school district favored this additional experience. Similar positive responses (52% to 66%) were given to "elimination of soft or non-essential courses from the curriculum." As expected, 52 to 67 percent stated "there should be more required and fewer elective courses." A majority of superintendents not only believed that more curricular are needed to prepare students for employment upon graduation, but 79 percent to 61 percent welcomed "input from business, labor and civic leaders" to help prepare students for the world of work.

Their open-ended responses to "which reforms were the most critical?" were:

> More rigorous curriculum and higher standards and expectations.
> Local curricular rather than state mandates.
> Standards must be adhered to--no more social or easy promotions for low achievers.
> Reading should be taught throughout the entire elementary curriculum at each grade level. This should be complemented with other skills such as writing and speaking. . . .
> In mathematics, we cannot teach a concept without sufficient practice. The curriculum must be changed so that each mathematical function is practiced and practiced before introducting new materials. We need both rigor and vigor in the curriculum.

The administrators' disenchantment with vocational education programs were reflected in their comments:

> Our present vocational programs at the federal and state levels are ridiculous to say the least. We certainly don't need more of the same.
> Too many students in the building trades--agriculture, auto mechanics, etc.

Instructional Time and Organization

Administrators were asked about increasing the amount of homework and time devoted to the proposed new basics programs. The majority (53% to 72%) agreed more time should be given to the new basics in general. They also

proposed a substantial increase (62%) in homework assignments at the secondary level (72%) and in combined school districts (65%). Superintendents (50%) and those heading elementary (58%) and secondary school (56%) districts while only 41 percent of combined school district superintendents favored a policy that would "establish firm, explicit and demanding requirements for homework." A much larger percentage (76% to 89%) concurred that there needs to be "more instruction in effective study and work skills."

However, they were ambivalent on a 200 plus school year. Only combined school district superintendents (54%) favored it. But the majority (71% to 72%) agreed that "school/classroom reorganization needs to be improved to expand instruction time."

Student discipline usurps instruction time. The sample was adamant about making student disciplinary and control reforms. A significant majority (76% to 89%) saw the need for stringent disciplinary rules and 70 to 90 percent recommended alternative programs for continually disruptive students. A similar majority (79% to 89%) wanted changes in attendance policies with clear incentives and enforced sanctions to reduce absenteeism and tardiness. In addition to wanting to control student deportment problems, superintendents (65% to 83%) saw a need to relieve teacher of unnecessary administrative burdens and classroom disruptions.

A less than majority (46%) of the total sample and elementary district superintendents (26%) and only a slight majority of secondary and combined school district superintendents (59% and 59%, respectively) were satisfied with mainstreaming for handicapped students. This indicates that superintendents were not impressed with current mainstreaming efforts, but they (70% to 79%) wanted additional instructional time for special education students.

The respondents' responses to the open-ended question: "What reforms are the most critical?". support the above views.

> Stop catering to those whose behavior in the classroom is disruptive.
> Better use of time in present school setting.
> Remove governmental requirements that force schools to perform non-educational tasks.
> Need well taught study skills programs.
> We need high standards in homework (amount and quality assigned and received), a mastery approach (not letting some get by on incomplete or poorly completed homework or classwork).
> Increase instruction time--outcomes determined and measured.
> Make schools more demanding.
> Improvement of instruction, not more courses.
> Motivation of student and parents.
> Increased efforts and success in academics; increased daily attendance.

One administrator commented:

> By requiring more math-science-English-etc.--this will basically "kill" our vocational programs--students need the basics but those not going on to further their education need the vocational training. Reorganization is not the answer.

Another added:

> Elementary schools should re-evaluate their purpose for being. If you can teach a child to read in the first 3 years, you can teach him anything. If he fails to learn how to read he is sentenced to a life of failure, frustration, and dependency.

Standards and Expectations

A major recommendation of all reform reports is the need for higher academic standards. Overwhelmingly the sample (83% to 89%) supported more rigorous and measurable standards. They (71% to 78%) also agreed that "state and local school systems should establish firm, explicit and demanding grading requirements," and that "student grades should realistically reflect student academic achievement"(87% to 97%, across all types of school districts).

The respondents appeared to be dissatisfied with the laxiety of current promotion and graduation policies, based on social-considerations and age. Eighty-two to 89 percent of administrators felt "promotion and graduation

policies rather than age should be the criteria for graduation." Similarly, they believed, but not strongly (47% to 54%) that students who are one year below grade level, academically, should not be promoted to the next grade level.

To accomplish these recommendation, the respondents (67% to 79%) supported the use of standardized tests at each transitional level in school. They thought formal evaluation should include:

1. Certification of student credentials (54% to 61%).
2. Identification of academic proficiencies (78% to 92%).
3. Identification for advanced study (78% to 80%).
4. Criterion for graduation (44% to 55%).
5. Criterion for differentiated diplomas (33% to 42%).

The sample only slightly favored requiring minimum achievement on a standardized test as the basis for graduation. Nor was a majority pleased with awarding differentiated diplomas based on standardized test performance. Their reluctance to agree with minimum competency testing may be found in the following comment:

> All high school students cannot pass three years of math-science unless it is greatly watered-down. Just to say every student has had three years of math and science is stupid.

Surprisingly, a majority (50% to 56%) also agreed with standardized testing being based on a nationwide system of state and local norms. Only 44 percent of elementary district administrators favored it.

The respondents were dissatisfied with the quality and content of teaching materials. Seventy-five percent to 79 percent recommended that textbooks and materials needed to be upgraded and updated to assure more rigorous and contemporary content. In addition, 86 percent felt the state and local school districts should evaluate textbooks, based on rigorous standards. This includes requiring publishers to furnish evaluation data on the "effectiveness, quality and appropriateness of their textbooks."

In regards to higher standards, the sample added the following suggestions:

> Standards must be established and adhered to--no more passing on of academically deficient students. Standards and expectations are most critical.

A number of administrators commented:

> Schools have become too diverse. We are now responsible for many areas which tend not to fall into the educational domain. Most of these areas are the result of federal and state mandates that take advantage of the "captive audience" posture which schools enjoy with students and parents. My fear is schools have become the "jack of all trades and master of none." If schools need anything--a re-definition of role would be most beneficial. By the time public schools play parent, nurse, optometrist, dietician, counselor, confessor, policeman, social worker, family planner, health agency, welfare agent and numerious other para-social roles, education becomes almost a by product of school function. To re-define schools and place prime, unyielding priority on quality education programs and outcomes is a necessity of education quality stands a change for improvement.

Programs for Special Students

An integral element of the reform package is to provide improved services for special populations. Three-fourths of the respondents favored such reforms. This included additional programs and funding for the gifted (80% to 89%), the socially disadvantaged (52% to 63%), the handicapped (57% to 78%), and non- or deficient English-speaking students (39%to 72%). Combined school districts (48%) rejected special or bilingual programs for the latter group. Also only 46 percent of the total sample and 30 percent of combined school district administrators favored special programs for minority students. Fifty-two percent of the latter districts rejected such programs. But 61 percent of both elementary and secondary districts agreed with it.

A much ignored student has been the slow or non-learner. In many instances these students get lost in the educative process, "fall

between the cracks." To the question "Special federally fellowship programs should be available to establish local individualized learning centers for repeated non-learners," 51 to 66 percent of the total and elementary and secondary district administrators, respectively, agreed. Combined district administrators were divided on the issue (39% for and 39% against). Several administrators wrote:

> Alternative schools must be created to meet the needs of student who do not learn in or traditional schools.

"Career-related courses for women and minorities" was the least well received proposal. Only secondary district administrators (56%) accepted it, while only 49 percent of all administrators and 47 and 59 percent of elementary and combined district heads rejected these programs.

Although the general sample was receptive to new programs for special student populations, the response may have been influenced by their resistive attitudes toward federal/state funding and mandates. Their open-ended comments reflect this:

> Reduce state and federal mandates that interfere with local ability to provide best possible program
> Do away with state mandates.
> With additional money we can do better, but without federal and state mandates.
> P.L. 94-142 should be reevaluated and the total cost of educating low incident handicapped children should be paid by the state and federal government.
>
> We can overcome our handicaps if we can fund them.
> Local control is a must but state mandates in some areas will be the only means to control local pressures that are in all schools. This would emphasize a state-wide consistency and achievement that is needed.
> Too many tasks in the may areas of education diffuse the efforts, resources and efficiency of our schools.
> Work with all student in all areas without too much classifying, separation and "marking" students.
> Lets leave all student together, to learn from each other to share and be American.

Graduation Requirements

The administrators generall supported the Commission on Excellence recommendation of a minimum curriculum for all students seeking a diploma which include:

1. Four years of English (56% to 84% favored it).
2. Three years of mathematics (58 percent and 84 percent of elementary districts and the total sample favored it, but secondary (61%) and combined district (54%) administrators rejected the reform).
3. Three years of science (49 percent of elementary districts and 71 percent of elementary districts supported the reform, while, again, 61 and 59 percent of secondary and combined districts, respectively, disfavored it).
4. Three years of social studies (51, 68 and 48 percent of all, elementary and combined school districts, respectively, agreed with the proposed requirement, but 61 percent of secondary district heads rejected it).
5. One-half year of computer science (56% to 82% favored the reform).
6. Two foreign languages for the college bound (61% to 74% embraced the proposal).
7. Proficiency in a foreign language--four to six years of study (53% to 67% disagreed with the recommendation).

The difference in responses of elementary and secondary/combined school districts on some of these issues is probably the result of the realistic assessment of their student body. Secondary school administrators realize from experience that many students could not successfully handle an extended rigorous mathematics, science, social studies and foreign language program. To reiterate the comments of several administrators: "all high school students cannot pass three years of math, science, etc. unless it is greatly watered-down. To say every student has had three years of math and science is stupid." Another factor may be the lack of priority "space" in the curriculum to accommodate additional sections of the subjects and the lack of qualified math, science and other specialized

teachers.

Others see the proposed reforms as a way of forcing students out of the easy courses"...where they goof off" and into "...calculus, trigonometry, physics and computer science." But only 24 to 29 percent advocated four to five years of foreign language study. Foreign languages have never been popular with American students or educators. This may be the result of America's national rather than international orientation, the emphasis on assimilation for immigrants and the lack of opportunity to use or apply foreign language skills in our society.

College Entrance Requirements

The recommendation of A Nation at Risk: Commission on Excellence. . . of requiring four year colleges and universities to raise their standards in line wih the proposed requirements for high school graduation was supported by 61 to 79 percent of the respondents, including the total sample and three types of districts.

When the question was reversed, i.e., that high schools should be required to raise their standards to meet those of college and university established standards, a smaller majority (53% of total sample. 63 of elementary and only 44% and 46% of secondary and combined school districts) favored the proposal.

Self-imposed academic standards are more acceptable than outside-imposed requirements. The elements of education autonomy, community socio-economic differences and expectations make it more desirable for school districts to set their own standards based on the nature of the student body and community --urban, suburban or rural. This point was emphasized in the respondents' open-ended comments. They basically rejected mandates and desired greater control over curricular, staffing and fiscal matters.

Teacher Reform

The Commission on Excellence, Twentieth Century Fund and Education, and the Commission of the States recommended the need for better prepared, higher quality and adequately rewarded teachers. Professionalization of teaching was an integral part of the reports.

In response "to professionalizing and making teaching more rewarding" 89 to 94 percent of the administrators supported these recommendations. The majority also agreed with the particulars of the recommendation. Eighty to 94 percent concurred with beginning and top career salaries of $20,000 and $50,000, respectively. Only a less than to a slight majority (44% to 62%) favored merit pay to attain excellence in teaching. On the other hand, they (64% to 72%) favored the master teacher concept to recognize and reward teaching excellence.

However, wages were not the only consideration. A substantial majority (83% to 91%) felt there "should be rigorous entry requirements based on the mastery of a body of knowledge", and a required "state-wide certification examination" to establish a standard (63% to 77%), across the different types of school districts). Introduction into teaching was another concern. They (89% to 94%) believed introduction into teaching should be supervised by experienced teachers and being responsible for technical decisions regarding supervision of novice teachers (56% to 85%). The respondents (72% to 90%) also supported required internships supervised by senior teachers before tenure is granted (72% to 79%).

The majority of administrators (57% to 68% of the total sample and elementary and secondary districts, respectively) agreed that teaching peers should define standard of practice." Only 44 percent of combined school

district administrators favored it. They were slightly more enthusiastic (56% to 67%) regarding" peer review to terminate incompetent teachers." Administrators (62% to 83%) also saw the wisdom of using paraprofessionals to relieve teachers of non-teaching duties and related chores.

In relation to teacher preparation a significantly high proportion of the sample (83% to 100%) stated that preservice teachers should: 1) meet high education standards, 2) show an aptitude for teaching, and 3) demonstrate competence in an academic/special area. Their responses to the open-ended question regarding the most crucial reforms, the respondents commented:

> Teacher preparation.
> Better teacher preparedness, higher salaries and good internship programs.
> Improvement of instructions, not more courses.
> Recertification of teachers every five years.
> Preservice preparation of teachers need improvement.
> It is critical that teachers ease their way into the profession with a maximum amount of assistance from master teachers.
> Better teacher preparedness. Better salaries for those in the profession; good internship program; secondary curricula where students go--college bound or work/trades oriented (one or the other not combinations; peer evaluation could be good.
> The concept of teacher coaches seems to be worth much more consideration.
> Legislatures should be motivated to raise teacher salaries at a level that is competitive with the private sector.
> Merit pay is too political, particularly when salaries are so low.
> More effective instruction.
> Better teacher preparation.
> Better recruitment efforts for better teachers.
> More incentives to retain good people in teaching.

Teacher Training Programs

The Commission on Excellence (Nation at Risk) and ECS Task Force reports included recommendations for teacher training institutions to restructure, review and upgrade the academic quality of the curriculum so that entering teachers will have to meet higher standards. Teacher training programs should be judged on the basis of the performance of their graduates. A 69

to 87 percent of the sample agreed. A larger majority (89% to 93%) not only felt that "teacher training programs should be closely monitored," but 61 to 76 percent concurred with the reform reports that university/ college teacher preparation programs should be judged on whether the graduates meet": 1)high education standards, 2) demonstrate an aptitude for teaching and 3) demonstrate competence in an academic/special area(s).

In regards to the latter criterion, a majority (62% to 78%) recommended all teachers should have at least one major in a discipline--math, science, English, etc. However, they were divided on the question, "There should be greater emphasis on academic content and fewer method courses in teacher preparation?" A majority of elementary school district administrators (56%) agreed with this proposition, while 49 perecnt of the total sample and 39 and 47 percent of secondary and combined districts heads, respectively, favored it.

Although the respondents (72% to 87%) proposed that senior teachers should supervise student teachers, they basically wanted no part of training teachers themselves. When asked "School districts should take over teacher training?",51 to 72 percent responded negatively. However a significant majority (83% to 87%) did agree that monetary incentives such as loans and grants should be made to attract students who major in the areas of math, science, foreign languages, etc., to the profession.

The sample's comments on these issues included:

> It is most improtant that preservice preparation of teachers needs improvement. The quality of the professors in most institutions of higher education is extremely poor if their teaching abilities are considered. It is time for massive changes in this area.
> Teachers need better instruction on how to teach.
> It is difficult to weed our incompetent teachers.
> If we are going to be recognized by others as a full-time profession, then we better be thinking about teachers being on a twelve month contract. This does not necessarily mean that teachers have to be with students another three months. There are many job responsibilities teachers could work on having the summer months that would benefit their classroom instruction.

Increase teacher work year.
Five year teacher preparation program; year five should be internship.
Higher teacher accountability.
Improved staff development.
Better teacher evaluation.
A change in attitude--we need to be more positive about the job we do.
Too many people in education who fit the mold--"Those that can do--those that can't do--teach!"
Hire good people--solves many problems (biggest problem, in my opinion).
Teacher preparation--universities are not doing their job. College instructors should have had elementary and secondary teaching experiences.
Tenure needs to be eliminated or adjusted so that tenure renewal is required after a period of a number of years, e.g., 5 years.
Many teachers need some kind of motivation to upgrade their teaching.

Administration Reforms

Included in the issue of school reform, and in particularly the professionalism of teaching was making change in the way the education systems are administered. The majority (61% to 73%) believed "there needs to be administrative reforms." This included holding educational leaders responsible for what happens in the schools. The sample (71% to 74%) agreed that "Schools should become more client oriented."

When it comes to administrators relinquishing some of their authority, they were not so generous. The respondents (46%, 51% and 60%, elementary, total and combined districts, respectively) rejected the idea that "teachers should assume many of the institutional tasks performed by administrators--e.g., curriculum development, supervision and student policies." However 50 percent of secondary school district heads favored the suggested reform.

One of the common complaints of teachers is classroom interruptions. Although the sample appeared to be aware of the problem, they both rejected and were ambivalent about whether teachers should determine the number of administrative classroom disruptions. The total sample (51%) and combined districts (60%) disagreed, while 49 percent of elementary and 56 percent of secondary school district heads agreed with the proposal. They were, however,

more positive on other reforms that gave teachers greater control over working conditions. School district administrators (51% to 83%) supported the idea that teachers should rely on peer support and assistance in solving problems regarding teaching practices. This encompassed greater teacher input into programs, texts and materials in the schools/classrooms (76% to 94%). Secondary district administrators (94%) appeared to be particularly enthusiastic about the projected reform. The respondents also favored a reduction in the layers of bureaucracy found in most large school districts, 56, 62 and 67 percent. respectively, for the total sample, elementary and secondary school district heads. Only 47 percent of combined school district administrators supported the proposition.

Their personal responses to needed critical reforms brought out issues and concerns not covered with the objective portion of the questionnaire. Administrators seemed particularly concerned with the effects of tenure, unions and funding on school reform at the local level:

> Review tenure laws.
> Need changes in tenure laws--local schools must have local control.
> Revise or eliminate the tenure law! All other attempts at reform are cosmetic.

One administrator felt that:

> Administrators cannot be effective until they have the same job security and legal protection now given only to teachers!

> As a trade off for raising teacher salaries, tenure and teacher unions should be eliminated.
> Growth of teachers unions will require more administration to ensure that a local agenda for learning is being followed rather than a union-planned and implemented program. Curriculum has to be the next area of attempted control--what else have the unions missed?
> Our biggest problems are teacher and support staff and unions.
> Equal access to tax rates for unit (combined) districts--same as other districts.
> Money--We Need More for schools to do a good job considering the impossible task of educating all students to their fullest potential. By and large we have excellent teachers, adequate supplies, good facilities, and supportive communities. With additional money we can do better (without federal and state strings attached).

Another administrators appeared to summarized other's feelings on the issue of funding:

> I believe that we are doing an excellent job in preparing students for their future. I do believe we need more money to start new programs and update the present ones. Rural education is in a depression today! We need to develop better vocational courses and computer courses. We do not need the government interferring with us. We need money for kids not for office workers. If so called reform is needed, reform the funding policies of the state and federal government for education. Fix it so the politicians can not take money away from education (few votes in education) and pad other areas (where votes are located). It scares me to death when I think about politicians trying to reform education! Look for the regressive educational results!
>
> Higher state funding for elementary districts. My districts' budget is $2,200,000.00. State aid is $131,000.00 and 20% of my students have Hispanic surnames. Some of the critical reforms are:
> Increase teacher work year, higher entry requirement into schools of education. Five year teacher preparation programs. Year five should be an internship.
> Recertification of teachers every five years.
> Recertification of administrators every five years.

Some administrators felt school reform will have little meaning or effect until there are fundamental changes in the social and family structure.

> The Nation at Risk and the State Committees are missing the point in most ways. I have been a school superintendent for 26 years so I can speak through experience. During the 50's and early 60's people wanted a quality education and told their sones and daughters to study and work hard to succeed. That is not being done today. Mom and Dad both work and fight the school at every chance to pamper their children. if standards are raised. The school is at fault! If the basketball team is not successfuly, it is the coaches' fault! If a student needs discipline, it is the principal's fault. The problem is in the family structure; not in the schools. Reform the family life, values, goals and objectives and the welfare system. Our biggest problems today:
>
> 1. Prearranged absences for vacation.
> 2. Excused absences for deer hunting.
> 3. Raising graduation requirements.
> 4. Being absent after basketball games.
> 5. Disrespect to teacher.
> 6. Snuff-and spitting same into library books.
> 7. Students taking easy subjects to goof off.

Others added:

> Greater involvement of parents and the community.
> Assumption of responsibilities by all agencies to resolve problems which confronts the learner: discipline, lack of safety, family problems, etc.

If you can guarantee the control of the factors outside of school (i.e., divorce, hunger, racial tension, absenteeism, etc.). I will guarantee you a vastly improved educational product at no higher cost!

One of the key reform issues is the attitudes of staff toward children. At present the attitude appears to be - how much will they pay for how little I can do. Shorten the school day, shorten the school year, etc., are all demands being made. Starting a teacher st $20,000; $30,000 or $50,000 is not going to change anything. In my opinion the reforms are nothing more than changing the cover of a book, nothing has been done to change an outdated set of graduation requirements, nothing has been done to change the delivery system and certainly nothing has been done to change the teacher. When all the fuss is over everything will be as it is.

The major reform is "What is the purpose of our educational system? Once that is addressed all the other issues will shake out? Money and college ACT, SATs are not the true purpose of education. Our top level advocates have lost track of that.

Reform Implementation

In addition to determining administrators' opinions of school reform, data were requested on how many of these reforms had been or were being implemented. The most frequently instituted reforms appeared to be in curricula areas, with standards and expectation, second and teacher reforms, last. The recent passage of SB730 by Illinois legislatures should facilitate reform implementation.

Curriculum Reform

Forty-six percent of all the respondents indicated there has been a renewed effort to emphasize basic subjects and skills in the secondary schools. This included 61 percent of secondary and combined school districts. Similar percentages were recorded for English (44%, 61% and 57%), mathematics (53%, 72% and 68%), science (43%, 50% and 57%), social studies (39%, 44% and 55%), and computer science (43%, 72% and 57%) of all, secondary and combined districts, respectively. Only a minority of secondary school districts have made positive changes in foreign languages (23%, 39% and 25%), fine arts (17%, 22% and 21%), vocational education (13%, 17% and 14%) and preparation for the world of work (25%, 44% and 27%) for the total, elementary and secondary district sample.

In the elementary school districts, the content areas that have been implemented most frequently were computer education (53% and 66%), math (61% and 46%) and English literacy and writing skills (55/60% and 50/50%) of elementary and combined schools districts, respectively. Fifty-eight and 42 percent of elementary districts have made significant reforms in their science and social studies programs. There appears to be few changes in foreign languages and the arts.

Although less than a majority of elementary (47%) and half of secondary (50%) districts have stressed skill mastery beyond the basics, very few districts (21% and 39%) have eliminated soft or non-essential courses form the curriculum, increased the number of required courses (24% to 26%, although 56% of secondary districts did), help from the business community (11% to 33%) or alternative programs for repeated non-learners (5% to 22%) of the total sample and types of school districts. (See Table II in appendices.)

Graduation Requirements

In regards to upgrading graduation requirements, only a moderate percentage of school districts have increased prerequisites to qualify for a diploma. Thirty-five percent and 29 percent of secondary and combined districts now require four years of English and one-half year in computer science, respectively. The districts have not dealt equitably with math (22%) science (29%) and social studies (23%) reform requirements (See Table II in appendices.) Nor have districts significantly raised the requirements of two foreign languages (28%) and proficiency (4-6 years training) in a foreign language (7%). However, 43 percent of combined districts mandated two foreign languages for college bound students.

Time

The various national reform reports recommended more time be made available for learning the new basics through better classroom management and organization of the school and school day.

The only reforms in this category that were implemented by the majority of school districts were: "stringent disciplinary rules for unruly students" (44% and 59% of secondary and combined districts), alternative programs for

continually disruptive students (56%), reduction in administrative classroom disruptions (56% and 50%, respectively, of secondary school districts) and more effective mainstreamed classes (48% of combined districts), stringent attendance and tardiness (61% and 55%) and promotion and graduation policies (56% and 57%) of secondary and combined school districts. A higher percentage (43% to 44%) of the total sample adopted academic policies rather than age as a criteria for promotion and graduation and tougher attendance policies to control absenteeism and tardiness.

On the other hand, less than a majority of the respondents in this study implemented associated reforms. Of the total sample only 23 percent increased time spent on learning the new basics, 24 percent gave additional homework assignment, 11 percent upgraded homework standards, 24 percent increased study skill instruction, 3 percent plan to adopt a 200 plus school years, 20 percent school and classroom reorganization, and 30 percent alternative programs for continually disruptive students. Thirty to 35 percent of all districts reduced administrative-caused classroom disruptions, increased effectiveness of mainstreaming and additonal instruction time for special students.

Standards and Expectations

Only a small majority of districts adopted more rigorous and measurable standards. Fifty percent of secondary districts have instituted grade policies that realistically reflect academic achievement. Forty-seven and 50 percent of elementary and secondary districts and 56 percent of combined districts have implemented standardized tests as the basis of moving students from one transitional level to another and to identify academic deficiencies. Combined districts (55%) have formed committees that rigorously evaluate texts.

Programs for Special Populations

While the various reform reports advised more assistance to meet the needs of a key group of students--gifted, handicapped, minority, etc., few of the surveyed sample appeared to have implemented the suggestions. Less than a majority implemented most of the recommendations. Only in the area of programs for the gifted and talented did a majority (56% and 57% of secondary and combined districts, respectively) adopt these suggested reforms.

Teacher Reforms

Albeit the different recommendations placed a heavy emphasis on improved methods of recruiting, training, retaining, rewarding and paying teachers, only an insignificant percentage of school districts have adopted the measures. The only reforms that had an adoption rate above 30 percent was the "use of senior teachers to supervise student teachers" in secondary (35%) and combined (47%) districts. It was probably a common practice before the publication of the reforms. The other adopted reform was teacher input into programs, texts and materials used in the school/classroom. Thirty-six, 53 and 49 percent of elementary, secondary and combined districts employed these proposals.

Even though the responses did not show any significant reform adoption. There were some interesting trends. Seventeen percent of the total sample use paraprofessionals for non-teaching duties; 15 percent have permitted faculty to assume such administrative responsibilities as curriculum, development, supervision and student policies; 19 percent of the total sample and 35 percent of secondary district administrators said they had reduced "the layers of administrative bureaucracy;" 14 percent indicated teachers can control the number of administrative disruptions; and a higher percentage

(26% and 29%) of all districts and combined districts, respectively are more client oriented.

Summary

It is apparent that most of the reforms not only require additional funding, staff and facilities, but time. Changes comes slowly, particularly where bureaucracies, traditional policies and ingrained practices are involved. This is especially true when responsibilities, authority and power change hands. Also few reforms will occur unless there is a government or legal mandate.

Such is the case in Illinois. On July 1, 1985, the Illinois General Assembly passed SB730, the Illinois Better Schools Program. The result of this study showed that Illinois administrators agree with the reforms in the Better Schools Program. The Reform proposal provides that teachers will have to pass a "Teacher Bar" examination for certification. (The Chicago Board of Education will no longer be permitted to certify their own teachers.) The certification test will assess basic skills and subject content knowledge in the applicant's specific subject field. Seventy-four percent of administrators in this study favored a state-wide certification examination, and 88 percent agreed that applicants be required to master a specific body of knowledge.

The Illinois reform proposal stipulates "Teachers will be evaluated" and supervised, with tenured teacher dismissal process streamlined. However, administrators trained by the State Board of Education in evaluation techniques will evaluate teachers. However, it also eliminates the current requirement of a due process hearing for dismissal unless required by the teacher; and reduces various time requirements in the due process hearing procedure. Although 59 percent of surveyed educators supported peer review

to evaluate incompetent teachers, it can be inferred that even a high percentage of administrators would favor the Illinois reform proposal's recommendation of administrative assessment of faculty.

The Illinois reform plan appears to tighten the control of school administrators and shifts responsibility from local school districts to Illinois State Board of Education while reducing statutory dismissal protection for teachers. For example the reform proposal,

> provides that nothing in SB730 shall be construed as preventing immediate dismissal of a teacher for deficiences which are deemed irremediable. And that failure to comply with the time dictates of the evaluation plan shall not invalidate the results of the remediation plan.

Another provision that appears to abrogate local control is the provision that,

> provides that any school district which has not evaluated all of its teachers by the end of the 1987-88 school year, or which fails to evaluate such teachers within every two years, thereafter, the SBE (State Board of Education) shall enter upon the district premises and evaluate the teachers.

The reform proposal also stipulates that...,

> no administrative certificates shall be issued after June 30, 1987, unless the applicant demonstrates knowledge and understanding of productive parent-school relations, high quality school climate and classroom organization and provide instructional leadership. Administrative certificates will be renewed every five years.

The reform also specifies that school boards provide school principals with a job description that makes their primary responsibilities the improvement of instruction and the curriculum and staff development. Although the respondents in the current studies were not asked about recertification of administrators and administrative competencies, 73 percent felt "schools should be more client oriented", and a significant majority (70% and 75%) recognized the need for curricular reorganization, updated course offerings and enhanced school/classroom climate and expanded instruction

time.

Provisions were made to reward outstanding teachers through performance pay programs. Compensation could include extended teacher contracts, career ladders and merit based pay. On these issues, 52 and 62 percent of administrators agreed that a merit pay system and a master teacher career ladder, respectively, should be established to reward excellence in teaching.

The Illinois reform plan will place greater emphasis on reading, math and science and provide equipment needed to accomplish this goal. And a new math-science academy will be established for gifted and remedial students, and vocation education will be upgraded. The SBE will fund a School District Reading Improvement Program to provide reading specialists, teacher aids, and other personnel to improve reading and study skills of students and, in addition, provide a $2,000 stipend to vocational teachers placed in the private sector for continuing education.

Also regional education services will be expanded for gifted, alcohol, substance abuse, and computer education programs and continuing education for teachers. The majority of respondents (70% and 80%) in this investigation supported increased emphasis on the basic content areas, study skills and alternative programs for gifted and students in need of remedial help. However, only 40 percent of the sample agreed vocational education should be more rigorous. Their comments indicated that rural school districts favored upgrading vocational programs, whereas urban and suburban administrators were disenchanted with the quality and future of their programs. But 69 percent welcomed input from business, labor and civic leaders to assist student with employment information and skill.

The Illinois General Assembly also authorized the SBE to provide grants to school boards for the development of "comprehensive fine art programs in

grades K-6 in music, art, etc." The majority (58%) of elementary school district heads favored more art programs for their students. However, 50 to 52 percent rejected rigorous art programs at the secondary level.

To inject rigor and standards into the curriculum, the SBE requires each school district to set student learning objective which meet or exceed state established goals. A significant majority (70% to 75%) of surveyed administrators supported this proposal. Furthermore, the recommendation that districts must evaluate the proficiency of all pupils in grades 3, 6, 8 and 10 in reading, math and language arts was sustained by 76 percent of the sample who recommended standardized achievement testing at each transitional level. But only 50 percent supported standardized testing based on a nationwide evaluation program.

The practice of social promotion for low achievers is discouraged by the Better School Program. Students who are one grade level or more below current placement shall be provided with a remedial plan, including tutoring, extended day, summer school or grade retention. Eighty-six percent of administrators concurred that students should be promoted on the basis of a measurable promotional policy, not age. But 51 percent rejected promotion for students who are one grade level below the achievement norm.

Two additional student proposals are to establish modified instructional programs to prevent students from dropping out of school and parent-teacher advisory committees to develop with the school board a written policy on pupil discipline. Although the present study did/not deal with dropouts, it did include questions on repeated non-learners for which the sample (51%) agreed that federally funded program should be established. In regards to discipline problems, the respondents (81%) recommended stringent disciplinary rules and "alternative programs (79%) need to be implemented for continually disruptive students."

To meet the needs of special student--handicapped, minority and pre-school children--the Illinois legislature authorized the SBE to contract with education instiutions for pilot-model programs for handicapped children--birth to age three and to increase reimbursement funding for special education personnel. The proposal also requires school boards to provide language instruction for all limited English-speaking children even where there is less than 20 such children in a school district. It is felt that young children who enter school at an early age do better throughout school and are less likely to get into trouble later in life. Illinois education reforms will permit children to enter full-day kindergarten at age five or less after September 1, 1988.

The results of the survey showed 70 percent and 50 percent of all to combined district administrators, respectively, favored additional programs for the handicapped and non or deficient-English-speaking students.

One of the reform rejected by the total sample (49%,only 39% approved) and accepted by secondary district administrators (56%) was funded "career-related courses for women and minorities". But the Illinois General Assembly passed a scholarship program for eligible women and minorities to begin and complete graduate training in educational administration. Similarly, scholarships are to be provided for "persons preparing to teach in areas of identified staff shortages." Eighty-four percent of all respondents embraced this latter provision.

A proposed reform not included in the survey, but passed by Illinois legislatures, was public accountability which requires school districts to report to parent, taxpayers, the Governor and General Assembly (a school report card) assessing the performance of their schools and students as compared to statewide and local standards.

The major question regarding the actual implementation of these reforms is funding. No state can fund reforms of these proportions without determining and finding the resources to pay for them--not just for one or two years, but for decades. Illinois is in such a dilemma.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was not to analyze the Illinois Better Schools Program, but the responses of school district administrators to the national reports' reforms. Overall the majority of respondents supported the proposed reforms of the national reports. The only suggested reforms they either rejected or were undecided was the increase in fine art and foreign language programs, an extended school year to 200 plus days, effectiveness of mainstreaming in elementary school districts, awarding of differentiated diplomas based on standardized tests, career-related courses for women and minorities and the assumption of administrative responsibilities for curriculum, supervision, student policies and control of administrative disruptions in the classroom by teachers.

On the other hand, school district administrators recognized curricular, organization, student staff problems and the need for change in their respective districts. For example, they recognized the need for upgrading curricular offerings, teaching materials and academic standards. Revised student policies and alternative programs were identified as means of providing a more manageable and conducive/quality learning environment. The respondents also understood and sympathized with the increasingly difficult role of teachers. Not only did most administrators recognize teachers' need for recognition, professionalism and autonomy but were willing to share certain supervisory and administrative tasks--teacher input into program development and text and material selection and only to a slight

degree curriculum development, supervision and student policy responsibilities and classroom autonomy regarding administrative disruptions.

If the findings are an indication of how school district administrators view school reform, the process of implementing of the Illinois Better Schools Program should proceed smoothly assuming adequate funding is available.

References

1. The Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (GPO Publication No. 065-00-00177-2). Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

2. Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy, Making the Grade. The Twentieth Century Fund, New York, 1983.

3. Education Commission of the States, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. ESC, Denver, Colo., 1983.

4. Illinois Senate Bill 730.

TABLE - I

OPINIONS OF EDUCATION REFORMS

	N=104 Total			N=40 Elementary			N=20 Secondary			N=44 Combined		
I. Curriculum (High School Curriculum)	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
A. There should be more time and emphasis on the basics at the high school level?	69	12	3	55	8	3	78	0	0	74	20	4
1. English	77	12	1	63	5	3	100	0	0	63	24	0
2. Math	74	4	1	63	5	3	94	6	0	74	20	0
3. Science	63	17	3	53	16	3	67	17	11	67	22	0
4. Social Studies	58	22	1	53	16	0	61	22	11	63	24	0
5. Computer Scinece	69	11	5	63	3	5	72	11	11	72	17	2
6. Foreign Languages	46	27	7	47	18	8	44	27	17	48	33	4
B. There should be more rigorous programs in:												
A. Fine and performing arts	34	45	7	34	34	8	39	50	6	33	52	9
B. Vocational education	40	44	6	45	21	8	44	39	11	30	63	2
C. Preparation for the world of work.	66	22	3	71	8	0	72	17	5	57	39	4
(Elementary School Curriculum)												
C. There should be more time and emphasis on the basics at the elementary school level?	77	6	2	74	5	3	67	0	0	80	11	2
1. Literacy in English	79	11	0	82	13	0	72	0	0	78	13	0
2. Writing Skills	89	5	0	95	6	0	67	0	0	91	9	0
3. Computational and Problem solving skills	85	7	0	95	5	0	72	0	0	87	11	0
4. Science	68	21	0	79	16	0	67	6	0	59	33	0
5. Social Studies	54	32	0	71	24	0	61	17	0	41	44	0
6. Foreign Language	40	38	4	58	26	3	39	33	0	30	46	7
7. Arts	45	36	4	58	29	3	44	33	0	37	41	7
8. Computer literacy and application	80	6	0	90	3	0	67	6	0	83	7	0

	N=104 Total			N=40 Elementary			N=20 Secondary			N=44 Combined		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
D. The academic experience should be more intense and productive?	71	9	3	74	3	3	67	6	0	67	17	4
1. Emphasis on mastery of skills beyond the basics?	78	13	5	84	8	5	78	11	6	74	17	4
2. Elimination of soft or non-essential courses from the curriculum?	60	28	5	66	24	5	61	17	17	52	39	2
3. More required and fewer electives courses?	57	28	6	58	26	8	67	22	6	52	30	7
4. More input from business, labor and civic leaders as to the skills needed for effective employment?	69	21	3	79	16	8	78	11	0	61	24	4
5. Special federal fellowship programs should be available to establish local individualized learning centers for repeated non-learners?	51	33	7	66	24	5	61	22	0	39	39	13
II. Graduation Requirements												
A. All students seeking a diploma should be required to complete:												
1. Four years of English.	71	24	1	84	5	3	56	39	0	65	33	0
2. Three years of Math.	58	38	1	84	8	0	39	61	0	41	54	2
3. Three years of Science.	49	44	2	71	18	3	33	61	0	35	59	2
4. Three years of Social Studies.	51	40	3	68	18	5	33	61	0	48	46	2
5. One-half year of Computer/Science.	73	17	3	82	8	0	56	33	0	72	20	7
B. The college bound should have:												
1. Two years of foreign languages.	68	26	4	61	29	3	61	33	6	74	22	4
2. Proficiency in a foreign language (4-6 years).	25	61	7	29	53	8	28	67	6	24	61	8

	N=104 Total			N=40 Elementary			N=20 Secondary			N=44 Combined		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
III. Time												
A. More time should be devoted to learning the new basics?	59	13	12	53	11	13	72	11	0	59	13	20
1. High school students should be assigned more homework?	62	23	13	47	21	29	72	22	0	65	28	7
2. State and local school systems should establish firm, explicit and demanding requirements concerning homework?	50	43	5	58	34	5	56	39	6	41	50	4
3. Should be more instruction in effective study and work skills?	83	13	3	87	5	5	89	6	6	76	22	0
4. There should be a 200-plus day school year?	48	42	8	45	45	8	44	50	0	54	33	11
5. School/classroom reorganization needs to be improved to expand instruction time?	72	23	2	71	18	3	72	28	0	72	24	2
6. Stringent disciplinary rules need to be implemented to meet the needs of continually disruptive students?	87	17	1	79	16	3	89	11	0	76	22	0
7. Alternative programs need to be implemented to meet the needs of continually disruptive students?	79	17	3	82	11	5	94	6	0	70	26	2
8. Administrative burdens on teachers and classroom interruptions need to be reduced?	71	22	2	71	24	3	83	11	0	65	24	7
9. Mainstreaming has met the needs of handicapped students?	46	39	14	26	50	21	50	28	22	59	33	7
10. Additional instruction time for special (slow learners and gifted) needs to be found?	73	17	5	79	11	5	78	11	11	70	24	2
11. Attendance policies need clear incentives and enforced sanctions to reduce absenteeism and tardiness?	84	11	1	79	18	0	89	6	0	89	7	2
12. Promotion and graduation policies rather than age should be the criteria for graduation?	86	6	5	82	0	11	89	11	0	89	6	2

	N=104 Total			N=40 Elementary			N=20 Secondary			N=44 Combined		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
IV. Standards and Expectations:												
A. Schools need to adopt more rigorous and measurable standards?	85	6	2	87	3	5	89	0	0	83	11	0
1. Student grades should realistically reflect student academic achievements?	92	6	0	97	3	0	89	6	0	87	11	0
2. State and local school systems should establish firm, explicit, and demanding requirements concerning grades?	76	19	4	71	24	5	78	22	0	72	15	4
3. Standardized tests of achievement should be administered at each level of transition in school?	76	17	4	79	8	11	67	28	0	78	17	0
a. To certify students credentials?	58	30	6	58	26	8	61	33	0	54	33	9
b. To identify academic deficiencies?	83	9	3	92	0	3	78	11	6	80	13	2
c. To identify opportunity for advanced study?	80	12	4	79	8	5	78	12	0	80	11	4
d. As a criterion for graduation?	50	40	5	55	37	3	44	44	0	50	35	9
e. As a criterion for differentiated diplomas?	39	43	10	42	42	11	39	50	0	33	41	15
4. Standardized tests should be administered as part of a nationwide system of state and local standardized tests?	50	45	5	45	48	6	56	39	6	50	46	4
5. Students who are one year below grade in achievement should be promoted to the next grade level?	35	51	11	40	47	11	39	50	6	28	54	13
B. Textbooks and material need to be upgraded and updated to assure more rigorous contents and contemporary information?	75	14	8	79	8	11	79	8	11	78	11	11
1. States and local school districts should evaluate tests on the basis of rigorous and clear presentation of content?	86	7	2	84	8	0	94	0	6	87	9	2

	N=104 Total			N=40 Elementary			N=20 Secondary			N=44 Combined		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
1. There should be rigorous entry requirements by mastery of a body of knowledge?	88	7	3	87	8	3	83	6	11	91	7	0
2. Induction in to teaching should be supervised by experienced practioners?	92	5	2	90	8	0	89	6	6	94	2	2
3. Peers should define standards of practice?	92	5	2	90	8	0	89	6	6	94	2	2
4. Increased responsiblity should be based on demonstrated competency?	57	30	9	68	24	3	67	28	6	44	37	15
5. Experienced practicioners should induct new entrants and be responsible for technical decisions?	89	6	2	87	5	0	100	0	0	85	9	4
6. Internships should be required?	79	14	5	79	18	0	56	28	17	85	7	4
7. Internships should be supervised by senior teachers before tenure is granted?	84	11	2	90	5	3	72	28	0	85	11	2
8. Paraprofessionals should assume non-teaching duties now performed by teachers?	76	17	5	78	16	3	78	17	0	72	20	9
9. Establish professionally competitive salaries for teachers--$20,000 starting with career increases to $50,000?	73	20	6	77	15	5	83	11	0	62	29	7
10. Master teacher program should be established--to recognize and reward teaching excellence?	87	5	5	90	5	3	94	0	6	80	9	9
11. Established peer review to terminate incompetent teachers?	66	27	7	72	21	6	67	28	6	64	27	9
12. Teachers should be required to pass a state-wide certification exam?	59	32	6	56	31	8	67	33	0	56	33	7
13. A merit pay system should be established to reward excellence in teaching?	74	20	4	77	15	3	67	33	0	73	18	7
C. Persons preparing to teach should be required to:	52	35	11	44	36	15	50	39	11	62	29	9
1. Meet high education standards?	88	6	3	87	5	3	83	6	11	89	9	0
2. Demonstrate and aptitude for teaching?	99	0	0	98	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0

	N=104 Total			N=40 Elementary			N=20 Secondary			N=44 Combined		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
2. States and localities should require publishers to furnish textbook evaluative data on effectiveness, quality and appropriateness?	78	14	3	84	11	0	67	17	6	80	13	4
V. Programs for Special Populations												
A. Additional programs need to be funded and implemented for special groups?	73	16	2	74	16	0	78	6	6	67	22	2
1. Gifted and talented?	84	12	1	84	8	3	89	0	0	80	20	0
2. Socially disadvantaged?	58	32	4	63	24	3	72	22	0	52	41	4
3. Minority students?	46	42	6	61	26	8	61	33	0	30	57	6
4. Non-or deficient English speaking students?	50	37	9	55	26	13	72	22	0	39	48	9
5. Handicapped?	70	26	2	76	16	3	78	17	0	51	37	2
6. Career-related courses for women and minorities?	39	49	7	40	47	8	56	33	6	30	59	6
VI. College Entrance Requirements												
A. Four-year colleges and universities should raise their admissions standards in line with the recommended requirements for high school graduation?	72	20	6	79	16	3	61	28	6	67	22	9
B. Colleges and universities should set their own admission standards and require that high schools raise their graduation requirements to meet them?	53	34	9	63	32	3	44	44	6	46	35	17
VII. Teachers												
A. Teaching should be made more rewarding?	90	6	2	90	8	0	94	6	0	87	7	4
B. Teaching needs to be professionalized?	91	3	3	90	5	3	89	0	6	91	2	2

	N=104 Total			N=40 Elementary			N=20 Secondary			N=44 Combined		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
3. Demonstrate competence in an academic area?	96	1	1	95	3	0	94	0	0	98	0	2
VIII. Teacher Preparation												
A. Teacher training needs to be improved?	82	1	3	69	0	5	89	0	6	87	2	0
1. Teacher training/programs should be closely monitored?	93	5	1	92	0	3	89	11	0	93	7	0
2. School districts should take over teacher training?	30	59	9	36	51	10	22	72	6	22	72	6
3. Senior teachers should supervise student teachers?	80	15	3	74	18	3	72	22	6	87	11	2
4. There should be greater emphasis on academic content and fewer method courses in teacher preparation?	49	38	10	56	33	3	39	44	7	47	38	13
5. All teachers should major in at least one discipline (e.g., math, science, English, etc.)?	71	20	7	77	13	8	78	17	6	62	27	9
6. Colleges and universities offering teacher preparation programs should be judged by how well graduates meet criteria under VII-C?	72	8	13	72	8	8	61	6	33	76	9	11
7. Incentives, such as grants and loans, should be made available to attract students to the teaching profession, particularly in the areas of science, math, foreign languages, etc.?	84	8	3	85	8	3	83	11	0	87	4	4
IX. School Reform												
A. There needs to be administrative reforms in the schools?	72	11	1	69	10	0	61	17	0	73	11	2
1. Teachers should assume many of the institutional tasks performed by administrators--e.g., curriculum development, supervision, and student policies?	41	51	4	46	46	3	50	39	0	33	60	7

	N=104 Total			N=40 Elementary			N=20 Secondary			N=44 Combined		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
2. Teachers should rely on peer support and assistance in working out problems of practice?	59	30	8	56	28	10	83	11	6	51	38	9
3. The layers of administrative bureaucracy should be reduced?	56	31	10	62	26	8	67	33		47	33	18
4. Teachers should control the number of administrative disruptions in the classroom?	42	51	4	49	44	0	56	44	0	29	60	9
5. Schools should become more client oriented?	73	14	6	74	15	5	72	17	11	71	11	7
6. Teacher should have greater input into programs, texts and materials used in the school/classroom?	80	16	3	82	13	3	94	6	0	76	18	4

TABLE - II

IMPLEMENTATION OF REFORMS

	N=104 Total			N=40 Elementary			N=20 Secondary			N=44 Combined		
I. Curriculum (High School Curriculum)	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
1. There should be more time and emphasis on the basics at the high school level?	46	10	8	26	3	16	61	6	6	61	16	5
2. English	44	17	4	29	5	8	61	22	6	57	21	0
3. Math	53	11	5	32	3	8	72	11	6	68	16	2
4. Science	43	19	6	29	8	8	50	22	11	57	25	2
5. Social Studies	39	19	6	21	12	11	44	22	6	55	23	2
6. Computer Scinece	43	19	8	18	11	13	72	6	11	57	27	2
7. Foreign Languages	23	35	7	13	18	±3	39	39	6	25	50	2
There should be more rigorous programs in:												
8. Fine and performing arts	17	31	6	11	18	11	22	44	6	21	36	2
9. Vocational education	13	32	7	11	16	13	17	39	6	14	43	2
10. Preparation for the world of work.	25	30	6	16	16	11	44	22	11	27	43	0
(Elementary School Curriculum)												
There should be more time and emphasis on the basics at the elementary school level?	41	13	6	37	11	5	28	0	22	48	21	0
12. Literacy in English	46	19	8	55	13	3	28	0	28	50	25	5
13. Writing Skills	49	19	8	60	13	3	22	6	28	55	27	5
14. Computational and Problem solving skills	45	23	9	61	13	3	28	6	22	46	39	7
15. Science	37	28	8	38	11	3	17	11	28	27	50	7
16. Social Studies	27	34	6	42	26	3	11	11	22	25	48	5
17. Foreign Language	8	48	6	13	48	3	11	11	17	7	61	7
18. Arts	15	46	6	18	47	3	0	28	17	21	52	5
19. Computer literacy and application	52	19	6	53	36	3	28	11	17	66	16	5

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
20. The academic experience should be more intense and productive?	33	23	7	40	16	8	33	6	6	34	30	9
21. Emphasis on mastery of skills beyond the basics?	40	32	5	47	18	3	50	11	11	34	48	5
22. Elimination of soft or non-essential courses from the curriculum?	24	41	9	21	34	11	39	11	22	25	55	2
23. More required and fewer electives courses?	33	32	6	24	29	11	56	6	6	36	41	2
24. More input from business, labor and civic leaders as to the skills needed for effective employment?	18	48	8	11	47	8	33	28	17	23	55	7
25. Special federal fellowship programs should be available to establish local individual-ezed learning center for repeated non-learners?	8	57	7	5	55	5	22	33	11	7	68	5
II. Graduation Requirements												
All students seeking a diploma should be required to complete:												
26. Four years of English.	35	25	6	29	13	8	28	22	11	43	39	2
27. Three years of Math.	22	38	5	26	16	8	17	33	6	21	61	2
28. Three years of Science.	19	40	6	26	13	11	6	44	6	16	64	2
29. Three years of Social Studies.	23	34	6	21	18	11	17	28	11	27	52	2
30. One-half year of Computer/Science.	29	30	7	26	13	11	33	17	6	30	50	5
The college bound should have:												
31. Two years of foreign language.	28	31	7	11	24	11	28	39	11	43	34	5
32. Proficiency in a foreign language (4-6 years).	7	48	7	8	29	11	6	50	11	4	66	2

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
III. Time												
33. More time should be devoted to learning the new basics?	23	25	12	24	13	13	28	17	11	25	34	11
34. High school students should be assigned more homework?	24	32	10	43	18	18	39	28	11	30	43	2
35. State and local school systems should establish firm, explicit and demanding requirements concerning homework?	11	47	10	13	26	13	17	50	17	9	61	7
36. Should be more instruction in effective study and work skills?	24	38	7	16	26	11	40	33	11	27	48	2
37. There should be a 200-plus day school year?	3	42	5	3	42	5	17	55	6	5	68	5
38. School/classroom reorganization needs to be improved to expand instruction time?	20	44	3	13	34	5	11	61	6	32	46	0
39. Stringent disciplinary rules need to be implemented to meet the needs of continually disruptive students?	54	24	3	26	26	5	44	22	6	59	27	0
40. Alternative programs need to be implemented to meet the needs of continually disruptive students?	30	33	7	16	26	11	56	7	6	34	33	5
41. Administrative burdens on teachers and classroom interruptions need to be reduced?	30	33	5	24	26	5	50	28	0	27	41	7
42. Mainstreaming has met the needs of handicapped students?	35	26	10	16	24	16	44	22	17	48	32	2
43. Additional instruction time for special (slow learners and gifted) needs to be found?	32	38	6	26	34	8	44	17	17	34	50	0
44. Attendance policies need clear incentives and enforced sanctions to reduce absenteeism and tardiness?	44	25	6	26	26	8	61	17	6	55	25	5
45. Promotion and graduation policies rather than age should be the criteria for graduation?	43	22	8	24	24	11	56	11	11	57	23	5

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
IV. Standards and Expectations:												
46. Schools need to adopt more rigorous and measurable standards?	36	28	8	32	18	13	40	33	6	43	30	5
47. Student grades should realistically reflect student academic achievements?	43	26	5	42	21	5	50	22	6	37	34	5
48. State and local school systems should establish firm, explicit, and demanding requirements concerning grades?	30	33	8	34	24	8	28	28	11	27	43	7
49. Standardized tests of achievement should be administered at each level of transition in school?	42	29	2	47	11	5	33	39	0	41	39	0
50. To certify students credentials?	23	41	8	29	26	8	11	44	11	21	52	9
51. To identify academic deficiencies?	44	23	6	50	11	5	33	29	6	46	32	7
52. To identify opportunity for advanced study?	37	30	6	37	21	5	33	28	6	36	39	7
53. As a criterion for graduation?	21	44	6	26	32	5	17	44	6	18	57	7
54. As a criterion for differentiated diplomas?	9	53	7	11	47	5	6	50	6	7	61	9
55. Standardized tests should be administered as part of a nationwide system of state and local standardized tests?	21	42	7	18	34	8	28	22	11	18	59	5
56. Students who are one year below grade in achievement should be promoted to the next grade level?	13	47	12	18	20	8	6	39	17	14	57	14
57. Textbooks and material need to be upgraded and updated to assure more rigorous contents and contemporary information?	40	25	10	40	18	8	33	22	22	41	34	9
58. States and local school districts should evaluate tests on the basis of rigorous and clear presentation of content ?	44	22	8	34	16	11	39	22	17	55	27	5

		Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
59.	States and localities should require publishers to furnish textbook evaluative data on effectiveness, quality and appropriateness?	22	40	9	26	29	8	22	28	22	21	52	7
V.	Programs for Special Populations												
60.	Additional programs need to be funded and implemented for special groups?	32	25	3	24	24	0	39	11	11	34	32	2
61.	Gifted and talented?	48	26	1	37	24	0	56	17	6	57	30	0
62.	Socially disadvantaged?	30	35	3	29	29	0	28	13	11	32	41	2
63.	Minority students?	15	46	6	24	34	3	11	56	6	5	55	9
64.	Non-or deficient English speaking students?	21	35	9	18	24	13	33	39	0	21	39	11
65.	Handicapped?	40	25	1	37	21	0	33	28	6	43	27	0
66.	Career-related courses for women and minorities?	7	52	7	5	45	8	11	44	11	9	59	7
VI.	College Entrance Requirements												
67.	Four-year colleges and universities should raise their admissions standards in line with the recommended requirements for high schools graduation?	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
68.	Colleges and universities should set their own admission standards and require that high schools raise their graduation requirements to meet them?	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
VII.	Teachers												
69.	Teaching should be made more rewarding?	21	39	5	18	26	8	28	44	6	23	48	0
70.	Teaching needs to be professionalized?	14	44	6	16	32	5	11	56	6	16	48	5

		Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
71.	There should be rigorous entry requirements by mastery of a body of knowledge?	18	37	7	18	24	8	17	44	11	21	46	7
72.	Induction in teaching should be supervised by experienced practioners?	25	32	6	26	18	5	39	33	6	21	43	9
73.	Peers should define standards of practice?	8	43	11	16	29	3	0	50	17	5	55	16
74.	Increased responsiblity should be based on demonstrated competency?	19	38	7	24	26	0	17	50	6	16	43	16
75.	Experience practicioners should induct new entrants and be responsible for technical decisions?	17	38	9	21	26	3	11	50	3	18	41	16
76.	Internships should be required?	11	46	6	16	29	5	6	67	0	11	52	9
77.	Internships should be supervised by senior teachers before tenure is granted?	6	49	3	11	32	8	6	56	6	2	61	11
78.	Paraprofessionals should assume non-teaching duties now performed by teachers?	17	45	4	13	39	0	24	53	6	22	44	7
79.	Establish professionally competitive salaries for teachers--$20,000 starting with career increases to $50,000?	6	57	3	8	41	0	6	77	0	4	62	7
80.	Master teacher program should be established--to recognize and reward teaching excellence?	9	54	2	10	39	0	12	71	0	9	60	4
81.	Established peer review to terminate incompetent teachers?	3	59	2	5	39	0	0	71	0	2	67	4
82.	Teachers should be required to pass a state-wide certification exam?	6	52	4	10	33	3	6	65	0	4	62	7
83.	A merit pay system should be established to reward excellence in teaching?	3	58	6	5	41	8	0	88	0	2	62	9
	Persons preparing to teach should be required to:												
84.	Meet high education standards?	28	28	9	31	15	5	17	47	12	27	33	11
85.	Demonstrate an aptitude for teaching?	36	25	4	36	13	3	29	41	6	38	29	4

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
86. Demonstrate competence in an academic area?	34	26	4	36	13	3	41	24	6	31	36	4
VIII. Teacher Preparation												
87. Teacher training needs to be improved?	16	22	1	21	8	5	18	35	18	11	27	16
88. Teacher training/programs should be closely monitored?	12	32	10	15	15	10	6	35	18	13	42	9
89. School districts should take over teacher training?	5	43	7	8	31	8	6	52	6	2	49	9
90. Senior teachers should supervise student teachers?	34	16	6	18	15	10	35	18	12	47	18	2
91. There should be greater emphasis on academic content and fewer method courses in teacher preparation?	4	39	13	3	31	10	0	47	12	6	40	18
92. All teachers should major in at least one discipline (e.g., math, science, English, etc.)?	14	19	12	8	23	15	24	30	12	16	33	11
93. Colleges and universities offering teacher preparation programs should be judged by how well graduates meet criteria under VII-C?	4	29	18	3	23	18	0	35	24	7	29	20
94. Incentives, such as grants and loans, should be made available to attract students to the teaching profession, particularly in the areas of science, math, foreign languages, etc.?	4	36	10	3	31	10	0	53	6	7	31	13
IX. School Reform												
95. There needs to be administrative reforms in the schools?	21	25	4	11	21	5	12	42	0	35	20	4
96. Teachers should assume many of the institutional tasks performed by administrators--e.g., curriculum development, supervision, and student policies?	15	41	4	15	31	5	12	47	0	11	49	4

		Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
97.	Teachers should rely on peer support and assistance in working out problems of practice?	20	35	6	15	31	8	24	35	12	24	26	2
98.	The layers of administrative bureaucracy should be reduced?	19	37	6	13	39	3	35	35	0	18	37	13
99.	Teachers should control the number of administrative disruptions in the classroom?	14	44	6	18	33	5	12	59	0	7	51	9
100.	Schools should become more client oriented?	26	25	12	18	23	13	24	35	12	29	22	13
101.	Teacher should have greater input into programs, texts and materials used in the school/classroom?	46	15	3	36	15	3	53	18	0	49	13	4